

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the November 19, 2007 final Office action. Claims 1, 6-8, 11, and 20 have been amended by this Amendment B, claims 2, 10, 12, and 23 have been canceled, and claim 24 has been added. Claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 13-23 of the application are thus presented for further examination. Reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

No New Matter

Aspects of claims 1, 8, and 20 as amended were originally presented in claims 10, 12, and 23. Therefore, claims 1, 8, and 20 present no new matter, and Applicants respectfully request examination of these claims as presented.

New claim 24 includes subject matter originally included in claim 4. Applicants respectfully request examination of the claim as presented.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 5, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,549,966 to Dickens et al (hereinafter Dickens) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,574,588 to Shapiro et al (hereinafter Shapiro). Applicants submit that the cited references fail to disclose each and every aspect of the claims.

Dickens teaches an intelligent universal serial bus (USB) switch for connecting multiple peripherals to multiple host computers. The switch receives data from a peripheral or host, forwards it to its intended destination, and allocates a peripheral to a particular host for a preset period of time (i.e., a timeout period) (see Dickens at Col. 2, Lines 42-58). The allocation of a peripheral to a host computer is independent of the allocation of another peripheral to any other host computer (see Dickens at Col. 9, Lines 20-34). The switch is transparent to the peripheral and the host computer such that the host and peripheral operate as though they are directly connected, and when the peripheral is switched to another host, the new pair operates as though they are directly connected (see Dickens at Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 12-55, and Col. 40, Lines 50-

59).

Shapiro teaches a peripheral device including solid state memory that, when connected to a computer, appears to the computer as a device other than the peripheral. Typically, the device appears as a storage device (e.g., a hard drive or CD ROM drive) for which drivers are already present in an operating system of the computer. The peripheral device then communicates with the computer and operating system via the storage device drivers and may install software on the computer (see Shapiro at Abstract and Col. 1, Line 24 - Col. 2, Line 7).

The Examiner does not assert that Dickens or Shapiro teaches an apparatus that installs a software load comprising **a migration utility** and **a user interface** on a computer to which the apparatus is connected wherein the user interface and migration utility guide the user to migrate files from one computer to another via a communications router integral with the apparatus. In contrast to the cited art, aspects of the present invention relate to an apparatus comprising a memory and a communications router. When a user connects the apparatus to a target computer, the apparatus automatically installs a migration utility. This utility provides a user interface that prompts the user to transfer the user's files from a source computer to the target computer via the communications router of the apparatus (see, for example, Application at paragraphs [0020]-[0024] and FIG. 2). In another embodiment, aspects of the present invention teach that the migration utility is installed on the computer which the user is guided to migrate the user's files from. To this end, claim 1 as amended recites, "... said memory storing a driver for the communications router and a software load to be installed on [[a]] the target computer to which the first connector is connected, wherein said driver and said software load are installed on the target computer from the nonvolatile memory in response to connecting the first connector to the target computer, **wherein the software load comprises a user interface for guiding a user to transfer files from the source computer to the target computer and wherein the user interface comprises a migration utility for guiding the user to migrate files from source computer to the target computer via the communications router.**" Claim 8 as amended recites, "... installing setup software from the nonvolatile memory of the integrated hardware device to at least one of the computers via the communications router, said setup software also residing in the nonvolatile memory, **wherein the setup software comprises a user interface for guiding a user to transfer files between the two computers and wherein the user interface**

comprises a migration utility for guiding the user to migrate files from one of the computers to the other one of the computers via the communications router." Claim 20 as amended recites, "... a user interface for guiding a user to transfer files from one computer to another computer via the communications router **wherein the user interface comprises a migration utility for guiding the user through a file migration**; and a setup program for automatically installing the user interface, wherein the computer readable media and the communications router are operatively connected between a first connector and a second connector, each of said connectors being adapted for connection to a computer, and wherein a target computer automatically installs the driver on the target computer and the setup program automatically installs the user interface on the target computer in response to connecting the first connector to the target computer **such that the user can migrate files from the target computer to a source computer connected to the second connector via the communications router."**

At pages 11 and 16 of the Office action, the Examiner asserts that U.S. Patent No. 6,370,603 to Usui et al. (hereinafter Usui) at paragraph [0083] and Dickens at Col. 1, Lines 25-30 teach a user interface and migration utility for guiding a user to migrate files from one of the computers to the other one of the computers via the communications router. Usui teaches an interactive communication system including audio, video, and text chat implemented via the Internet (see Usui at, for example, Abstract). Paragraph [0083] of Usui merely describes installing a piece of software on a computer from local memory via a menu screen displayed to a user. The cited portion of Dickens merely describes operation of a USB bus. None of the cited references disclose a migration utility, much less the combination of a migration utility in an apparatus including a communications router and local memory for installing the migration utility on a computer connected to the apparatus as recited in claims 1, 8, and 20 as described above.

Thus, none of the cited references alone or in combination teach or disclose each and every element of claims 1, 8, and 20 as amended. Claims 1, 8, and 20 are allowable over the cited art, and claims 2-7, 9, 11, 13-19, and 21-22 depend from these claims and are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

Claims 2-4, and 7-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dickens in view of Shapiro in further view of Usui. Claims 2-4 and 7 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as explained above. Claims 9, 11, 13 and 15-19 depend from claim 8 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 8, as explained above. Claims 21-22 depend from claim 20 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 20, as explained above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 8, and 20 are allowable over the cited art. Claims 3-7, 9, 11, 13-19, and 21-23 depend from these claims and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1, 3-9, 11, and 13-23 are allowable over the cited art and that the subject application is now in condition for allowance. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Examiner should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

The Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

Applicants do not believe that a fee is due in connection with this response. If, however, the Commissioner determines that a fee is due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. Bain/

Robert M. Bain , Reg. No. 36,736
SENNIGER POWERS LLP
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

RMB/MAP/lav